

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PROJECT NAME: REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES 03761, 03762, 03764, 03765 IN BRIDGEPORT

PROJECT No.: 0015-0363

TOWN/CITY: BRIDGEPORT, CT

DATE UPDATED: Friday, May 09, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
1	Question:	Section 2.2.2, page 11 of the RFQ states the requirement for prequalification in Work Classifications No. 7 (Road Construction and Rehabilitation) and 10 (Major Bridges). Similar to the allowance for joint venture partners – If a construction contractor is prequalified in only one of these classifications and has a major subcontractor prequalified in the other, may these individual pre-qualifications be combined to satisfy this requirement?	I	
	Response:	No. The qualification requirements for this project require the Construction Contractor to be pre-qualified in the classifications of work required for the project. Contractors may combine pre-qualifications by the formation of Joint Ventures. Sub-Contractors may not be used to fulfill these requirements		
2	Question:	Are there any special forms that the JV must submit prior to submission of the SOQ?	F	1
	Response:	The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures have been revised and will be provided as part of Addendum No. 1		
3	Question:	Does the Joint Venture just submit the letter described in the Bid Manual with the SOQ?	F	1
	Response:	The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures have been revised and will be provided as part of Addendum No. 1		
4	Question:	Does the JV need to submit a Power of Attorney Form prior to or with the SOQ, or not at all?	F	1
	Response:	The sections of the RFQ regarding pre-qualification and submission requirements for Joint Ventures have been revised and will be provided as part of Addendum No. 1		
5	Question:	Was it intended to link the first three fields under section A of Form SOQ-C255? When text is entered into any one of those fields, it duplicates that text in the other two. It appears these should be three distinct responses.	F	1
	Response:	No. The PDF form contained a mistake that produced this error. The Form has been updated and has been included in Addendum No. 1		
6	Question:	Was it intended to have the "Proposed Project Manager" (rather than the Construction Manager) sign underneath the "Proposed Project Executive" in the Form SOQ-C255?	I	
	Response:	No. According to the definitions of "Key Personnel" stated in the RFQ, the "Project Executive" is the individual empowered to bind the Proposer and execute documents on its behalf for this project. The only instance where that scenario would be accurate is in the event the "Proposed Project Manager" or "Construction Manager" is also the "Project Executive"		
7	Question:	Was it intended to have the Proposed Project Executive under Section A of form SOQ-C255, be the Contact under section B, as well as the signatory under Section J?	I	
	Response:	Not necessarily. This person can be a separate contact person designated by the proposer. The signatory in section "J" is the "Project Executive"		
8	Question:	Would the Department consider eliminating the requirement to list <u>all proposed subcontractors</u> in the Form SOQ-C255, as it creates a less competitive environment for general contractors to receive pricing and select subcontractors due to the fact that the project design has not yet been fully developed by the "Proposers Engineer of Record"?	F	1
	Response:	The intent of this section is not to list subcontractors for contracting purposes, but rather give the Proposer an opportunity to be able to use the experience and qualifications of proposed subcontractors to showcase the strength of its team. It also allows the Proposer to identify any "Key Personnel" employed by a proposed subcontractor. The form will be updated to clarify this section		
9	Question:	Would the Department consider limiting the subcontractor listing to only major subcontractors with scopes in excess of \$1 Million dollars, with the listing of multiple subcontractors occurring in the RFP phase not the SOQ phase?	F	1
	Response:	See response to question number 8		
STATUS: F-Final R-Revised I-Information Only				

Disclaimer:

The availability of the Questions and Responses does not relieve prospective proposers of their obligation to review and become familiar with the RFQ and other relevant project and bidding requirements. The RFQ and addenda issued by the Department take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on Web sites

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PROJECT NAME: REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES 03761, 03762, 03764, 03765 IN BRIDGEPORT

PROJECT No.: 0015-0363

TOWN/CITY: BRIDGEPORT, CT

DATE UPDATED: Friday, May 09, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
10	Question:	Page 15 of the RFQ, Section 2.3.3. Organization Chart states "Identify the Proposer and all Major Participants in the chart(s)." Please provide a definition of the term Major Participant.	F	1
	Response:	This section of the RFQ will be revised in Addendum No. 1 to remove the reference to "Major Participants"		
11	Question:	Designers are prohibited from providing CT DOT employees as references for Section H of the 255 form. Does the same restriction apply to Contractors?	I	
	Response:	This rule relates to Consultant Selections. The Consultant Selection Office rules do not apply for the Design-Build pilot project. The Department expects to evaluate the full range of the Proposer's qualifications, experience and past performance as indicated by the qualitative rating criteria in the RFQ. Proposers should select references which best illustrate their range of capabilities.		
12	Question:	Section 2.3.2 Key Personnel states that the Construction Manager may be the same person as the Construction Superintendent. Considering a project of this size and complexity, we propose to combine management functions and have one person act as both the Project Manager and Construction Manager, and assign a separate Construction Superintendent. Is this substitution acceptable?	F	2
	Response:	This section of the RFQ regarding Key Personnel has been revised as part of Addendum No. 2 to address this question.		
13	Question:	Will the Department allow the Contractor to print the Organization Chart on 11 x 17 paper?	I	
	Response:	Yes, however it must be folded to fit within the footprint of the other submittal documents.		
14	Question:	Section 2.9.1 Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certification states: "....the Proposer (each respective participant, as described in Chapter 1) shall complete and submit a Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certification (Certification Form) for itself, and a separate set of forms for each of its key personnel." Please confirm that the intent is to have the Proposing Firm complete a form on behalf of the firm, and also have each Key Personnel listed in Section 2.3.2 complete a form.	I	
	Response:	The Conflict of Interest and Unfair Competitive Advantage Certification form must be completed and signed by the Proposer, its Key Personnel, and any member of the Proposer's team that is aware of a conflict of interest or unfair competitive advantage.		
15	Question:	The SOQ instructions that follow page 29 of the RFQ state that "Section K of each form can be used to expand on the requested information." For form C255 it appears Section I is intended for this information. Please confirm.	F	2
	Response:	This is correct. The Instructions for SOQ Forms D255 and C255 have been updated as part of Addendum 2		
16	Question:	In reference to SOQ forms C255/D255, please clarify if respondents are restricted to the page limits implied by the RFQ blank forms. Specifically, are the eight (8) projects required for Section F restricted to fit 2 pages or can these be modified to fit the requested information (e.g. one project per page)? Similarly, in reference to SOQ form D255 Section G, are respondents limited to fitting the space provided, or can the form be expanded to fit the requested information?	F	2
	Response:	The SOQ forms are not to be altered in any way. Section K of the D255 form and section I of the C255 form may be utilized as instructed in those sections to provide additional information to the page limit allowed. Clarification has been added to the SOQ instructions as part of Addendum 2		
17	Question:	In reference to SOQ form D255 Section G, are respondents limited to 3 projects?	F	2
	Response:	The SOQ forms are not to be altered in any way. Section K of the D255 form and section I of the C255 form may be utilized as instructed in those sections to provide additional information to the page limit allowed. Clarification has been added to the SOQ instructions as part of Addendum 2		
18	Question:	We are experiencing a problem typing information into Form: SOQ C255 and Form: SOQ D255. Specifically, sections D, H and I in Form: SOQ C255; and sections D and K in Form: SOQ D255. When typing info into those sections one line of text will only be visible. Please advise.	F	2
	Response:	We are aware of the issue and have revised the forms as part of Addendum 2		
STATUS: F-Final R-Revised I-Information Only				

Disclaimer:

The availability of the Questions and Responses does not relieve prospective proposers of their obligation to review and become familiar with the RFQ and other relevant project and bidding requirements. The RFQ and addenda issued by the Department take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on Web sites

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

PROJECT NAME: REHABILITATION OF BRIDGES 03761, 03762, 03764, 03765 IN BRIDGEPORT

PROJECT No.: 0015-0363

TOWN/CITY: BRIDGEPORT, CT

DATE UPDATED: Friday, May 09, 2014

No.	QUESTION DETAILS		STATUS	ADD. No.
19	Question:	Section 2.3.1 states that with its "Declaration of Joint Venture" the joint venture Proposer must identify which parts of the work each firm which compose the joint venture is responsible. The purpose of a joint venture is to synthesize the strengths of each partner into an integral whole. The different aspects of work required on this project will be carried out by a combined effort of both joint venture partners and do not lend themselves to subdivision. Please reconsider this requirement for the Statement of Qualifications.	F	2
	Response:	The language of that section asks for an explanation of the work each firm will do. If more than one JV partner intends to perform a given item, multiple firms may be indicated. If it is in fact a synthesis of effort, then the Proposer should have a Declaration of Joint Venture and an explanation, that clearly explains this and how it relates to their shares and responsibility for the work. Proposers are cautioned however that <u>vague proposals will not receive favorable ratings</u> .		
20	Question:	Due to the scope of this project falling in the \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 range, can the Project Executive also serve as the Project Manager?	F	2
	Response:	This question has been addressed in Section 2.3.2 of the RFQ as part of Addendum 2		
21	Question:	Section F of forms D255 and C255 limit the projects to be listed to the past 5 years. Can this period be extended to the past 10 years to more completely encompass the experience of the Proposers?	F	2
	Response:	The Department has revised the timeframe to 10 years. This is reflected in the SOQ forms revised by Addendum 2		
22	Question:	The Statement of Work Under Contract form page 2 (Addendum #1, RFQ Pages 48-49), states, "Contact the Contracts Unit if you need more space in the document." Additional space is required. Could this form be re-issued as an excel file similar to the standard DOT Part C form which is provided in Excel format?	F	2
	Response:	The PDF form has been revised to contain additional pages as part of Addendum 2. Please see the new form for instructions.		
23	Question:	Would you please clarify some information on Project No. 15-363, Bridgeport Route 8 Bridges RFQ (CSO #2226). According to the RFQ documents, I believe you are seeking RFQ's now for Design Build teams, and RFP's to short list are targeted around August. The Scheduled for Advertising DOT list http://www.ct.gov/dot/lib/dot/documents/dfiscalprojects/advschedule.pdf has this project targeted for October??? There seems to be a conflict of info, and I just want to be sure to provide the correct dates and status to our customers.	I	
	Response:	The RFQ advertised at " http://www.biznet.ct.gov/scp_search/BidResults.aspx?groupid=64 " or the CT DAS Contracting portal for Department of Transportation Bids and RFPs Solicitation # 2226 contains the schedule for the Qualifications phase of this project. The RFP will be given to the shortlisted firms after the Qualifications phase. Please visit that site and review the RFQ documents for the RFQ phase.		
STATUS: F-Final R-Revised I-Information Only				

Disclaimer:

The availability of the Questions and Responses does not relieve prospective proposers of their obligation to review and become familiar with the RFQ and other relevant project and bidding requirements. The RFQ and addenda issued by the Department take precedence over and supersede all other information posted on Web sites